This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

TANFORD UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS
UNIVERSITY SERIES

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
VOLUME I NUMBER 1

THE MODERN ENGLISH ERB-ADVERB COMBINATION

BY
ARTHUR GARFIELD KENNEDY
Instructor in English Philology

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA
PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY
1920

LELAND STANFORD JR.
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

THE GIFT OF
the author

135

STANFORD UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS
UNIVERSITY SERIES

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
VOLUME I NUMBER 1

THE MODERN ENGLISH VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION

STANFORD LIBRARY

BY

ARTHUR GARFIELD KENNEDY

Instructor in English Philology

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA
PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY
1920

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
PRESS

STANFORD LIBRARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY 7

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION 9

SECTION II. THEORY AND HISTORY OF VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION IN ENGLISH 11

1. Verbs with inseparable and separable particles.
2. Development of each type in English.
3. Literal adverbial modification.
4. Development from figurative usage.
5. Attitude of recent critics and writers.

SECTION III. VALUES OF THE VARIOUS ADVERBIAL PARTICLES 19

About	By	Off	Thru
Across	Down	On	To
Around (or Round)	For	Out	Up
At	In	Over	With

SECTION IV. GENERAL EFFECTS OF COMBINATION 26

A. SYNTACTICAL.

1. Transformation of intransitives into transitives.
2. Transformation of transitives into intransitives.
3. Change in the character of the object governed by the verb.
4. Development of active-passive verbs.

B. SEMASIOLOGICAL.

1. Mere adverbial modification of the meaning of the verb.
2. Intensification or extension of the meaning of the verb.
3. Creation of new meanings.
4. Mere repetition of an idea implied in the simple verb.
5. Development of special meanings and uses.

SECTION V. PECULIARITIES OF COMBINATION 29

1. Syllable length of verbs combined.
2. Origin of verbs combined.
3. Verbs rarely used alone.
4. Separation of verb from particle.
5. Relation of the modern verb-adverb combination to the synonymous Latin derivative.
6. Combination with two particles.

SECTION VI. BEGINNINGS AND CAUSES OF COMBINATION 33

a. Desire for emphasis.
b. Desire for variation in expression.
c. Desire for rhythmic effect.
d. Linguistic laziness.

SECTION VII. RESULTS OF THE INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF COMBINATIONS 35

1. Multiplication of meanings for the same combination.
2. Multiplication of combinations for the same meaning.
3. Loss of simple verbs of specialized meaning.

SECTION VIII. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS 40

1. A proletarian process.
2. A native, Teutonic, process.
3. A lessening of the vocabulary to be memorized.
4. A more picturesque, more highly figurative, usage.
5. A continuation of an already well established tendency to emphasize syntactical combination in English.
6. A tendency to weaken the individuality of verbs.
7. Increased possibilities of confusion and misunderstanding.
8. Lessening of the capacity for precision.
9. Encouraging of linguistic slovenliness.

APPENDIX I. NOUNS MADE FROM VERB-ADVERB COMBINATIONS..... 47

APPENDIX II. ADJECTIVES MADE FROM VERB-ADVERB COMBINATIONS 50

PREFACE

The following study has been undertaken with a view to the presentation in a fairly detailed and definite manner of a phase of linguistic development which has been the subject of not a little protest and controversy on the part of those who are accustomed to watch with jealous care the use of their mother tongue. Most of the adverse criticism of the verb-adverb combination has contented itself with attempting to show either that certain combinations are colloquialisms not yet justified by general usage, or else that in certain cases the adverbial particle is unnecessary or, as one critic has termed it, a parasitical preposition.

I planned at one time to collect and print, in so far as I might be able, all the combinations of verb and prepositional-adverb which I might come across, and under each a list of the meanings of which it might be susceptible. But as my study of the subject has progressed, I have found such a plan impracticable for several reasons. In the first place, one is not dealing with a fixed category of English speech, but with a changing, growing tendency in language which throws up over night, as it were, new combinations, and new meanings, so that an absolute and complete list would be impossible of realization. Moreover, the greatest portion of these combinations has been well illustrated in *Webster's New International Dictionary* and in *The New English Dictionary*. And, finally, if the list were even approximately complete and properly illustrated, it would fill more printed pages than such a study would seem to warrant. So I have had to content myself with gathering, zealously and carefully, as extensive a collection of combinations and meanings as possible, and after a thorogoing examination of the collection, publishing the summaries and conclusions deduced therefrom. I have endeavored to avoid, wherever it might be possible, duplication or repetition, and by so doing I have utilized at one time or another a large part of my material, which comprises over nine hundred different combinations, representing several thousand distinct meanings.

My illustrative matter has been collected from various types of literature. The average college freshman theme, of course, abounds in colloquial combinations of the verb and prepositional-adverb. Such works as O. Henry's *Sixes and Sevens* and Chester's *Wallingford* stories teem with them. The juvenile book of recent coinage and such technical works as the medical or the engineering treatise furnish many illustrations. Any volume of current literature is sure to illustrate this combining tendency in English, and almost any lecture or conversation will likewise supply mate-

rial for the study. But most significant of all, perhaps, is the fact that the editors of *Webster's Dictionary* and of the *New English Dictionary* have used the verb-adverb combination very freely in defining other words.[1]

I have come somewhat hesitatingly to the point of publishing my study of the combination just because I realize that its meanings and its uses fluctuate so much as yet that it is very hard to give definitions and classifications that will be generally acceptable. Often, indeed, the combination has several meanings, part of good literary standing, part purely colloquial. For example, one can *call off* names, a dog, or an engagement; *get up* may mean 'to arise,' 'to organize,' or 'go faster'; *make up* signifies 'to make ready,' 'to become reconciled,' or 'to prepare for the stage'; *put up* 'to lay away,' 'to tolerate,' or 'to lodge'; *turn out* 'to turn aside,' 'to eject,' or 'to appear.' These combinations are capable of such varying shades of meaning that no two persons will show quite the same reactions toward them. Consequently I have made little effort to distinguish slang and colloquialisms, but have offered most of the material gathered trusting that the reader will be able to determine for himself in each case whether the phrase is to be classed as good, literary English or as colloquial or slang. I hope, however, that my study may prove suggestive to the average speaker of English and may even lead some to a more thoughtful use of these combinations.

[1] In *Webster's Dict.*, for example, cf. *average v. 2* 'to close out a transaction,' *close v. 1* 'to stop, or fill up, as an opening,' *blow 6* 'to puff up,' *bore 2* 'to enlarge and true up (a hole),' *cage* 'to shut up or confine,' *chuck* 'to throw up, to give up,' *dole 2* 'to deal out,' *get at* 'to come at'; or in the *New English Dict.* cf. *act 2* 'to bring into action, bring about,' *air 5a* 'to show off, to parade ostentatiously,' *back 19* 'to back down, to recede downward from a position taken up,' *bag. v.14* 'to bag up, to put up in a bag; to shut or store up generally.' Not infrequently the editors of the *N. E. D.* have utilized combinations in writing definitions which they have failed to define or illustrate in their proper places, which seems to show that some of our verb-adverb combinations are more necessary in the expression of ideas than scholars are willing to admit formally.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The New English Dictionary.

C. F. Koch: Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache. 2. aufl. 3:116–146. 1891.

T. O. Harrison: The Separable Prefixes in Anglo-Saxon. Johns Hopkins diss. 1892.

H. Eitrem: Stress in English verb+adverb groups. Englische Studien 32:69–77. 1903.

Webster's New International Dictionary. 1909.

T. A. Rickard, W. H. Shockley, A. E. Pratt: Standardization of English in Technical Literature. Excerpt from The Transactions of the Institution of Mining and Metallurgy for 1909–10.

J. Ellinger: Ueber die Betonung der aus Verb+Adverb bestehenden englisch-Wortgruppen. Progr. der Franz Joseph-Realschule in Wien. 1910.

John Kirkpatrick: Handbook of Idiomatic English. Paris, 1912.

Geo. O. Curme: The Development of Verbal Compounds in Germanic. Beitr. z. Gesch. d. deutschen Sprache u. Lit. 39:320–361. 1914.

Early English Literature Cited

Alfred's Bede—T. Miller: The O. E. Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History. Early Engl. Text Soc. 95–96. 1890.

Aelfric's Saints' Lives—W. W. Skeat: Aelfric's Lives of the Saints. Early Engl. Text Soc. 76. 1881.

Ancren Riwle—Maetzner: Altenglische Sprachproben Bd. I, Abt. 2, pp. 1–41. 1869.

Bale's Kynge Johan—J. M. Manley: Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama 1:525–618. 1897.

Ballad of Robin Hood and the Monk—Sargent and Kittredge: English and Scottish Popular Ballads. pp. 282–286. 1904.

Beowulf—W. J. Sedgefield: Beowulf. 2nd. ed. 1913.

Chaucer's Canterbury Tales—W. W. Skeat: Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Vol. 4. 1894.

Conversion of St. Paul—J. M. Manley: Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama 1:215-238. 1897.

Dame Sirith—Zupitza-Schipper: Alt- und Mittelenglisches Uebungsbuch. 7. aufl. pp. 131–138. 1904.

Havelok—W. W. Skeat: The Lay of Havelok the Dane. 1902.

Juliana—Grein-Wülker: Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie 3:117–139. 1898.
King James Bible—A. W. Pollard: The Holy Bible. A Facsimile. 1911.
Mandeville's Travels—A. W. Pollard: The Travels of Sir John Mandeville. 1905.
O. E. Genesis—Grein-Wülker: Bibliothek d. ags. Poesie 2:318–444. 1894.
Owl and Nightingale—J. E. Wells: The Owl and the Nightingale. 1909.
Paston Letters—Jas. Gairdner: The Paston Letters. 1901.
Piers Plowman—W. W. Skeat: The Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman. 9th ed. 1906.
Testament of Love—W. W. Skeat: Chaucerian and Other Pieces. pp. 1–145. 1897.
Witch of Edmonton—Ernest Rhys: Best Plays of Thomas Dekker. pp. 387–473. 1904.

Recent Literature Cited

Bible—Revised Version of 1882.
Four Years—J. W. Gerard: My Four Years in Germany. 1917.
H. Finn—S. Clemens (Mark Twain): Huckleberry Finn. 1884.
Iron Heel—Jack London: The Iron Heel. 1908.
Outlines—Jno. D. Barry: Outlines. 1913.
Sixes and Sevens—O. Henry: At Sixes and Sevens. 1911.
Wallingford—J. R. Chester: Wallingford in His Prime. 1913.

MODERN ENGLISH VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

I have avoided the use of the term 'verb-adverb compound' because I do not wish to give the impression that in all the combinations that I have studied and cited hereinafter the verb and combining particle are welded together with a uniform closeness. On the contrary, these combinations differ greatly in respect to closeness of combination. In some, as, for example, *bear out* 'corroborate,' *come by* 'acquire,' *get at* 'reach,' *hit it off* 'agree, be congenial,' *make out* 'understand,' *own up* 'confess,' *put out* 'extinguish,' *stack up* 'fare,' *whack up* 'share or divide,' the elements of the combination have almost or altogether sacrificed their individual meanings and by the act of combination have assumed a new meaning; these may, without hesitation, be termed compounds. In other combinations, however, and by far the greatest number, the verb is modified in meaning by a certain weakly adverbial function of the particle but does not entirely merge its verbal personality in the combination. The particle, it is true, loses much of its usual adverbial or prepositional signification but in the combination assumes peculiar adverbial values, as, for example, in *bake up* 'make a batch of,' *blossom out* 'blossom in a showy manner,' *blot out* 'destroy,' *bottle up* 'enclose in a bottle,' *button up* 'fasten with buttons.' And in many others, finally, the usual values of verb and prepositional-adverb remain fairly evident, as in *brush off, brush out, bubble over, burn down, cave in, fall down, flame up, hang up, leak out, rinse out, tack down.*

It becomes evident at once that this last group of combinations shades off so imperceptibly into the great mass of adverbial modifications such as *fly away, walk south, go home,* etc., that it would be a hopeless undertaking to attempt to classify every verb-adverb combination as either close enough to be termed a verb-adverb compound, or loose enough to be called merely an adverbial modification. And so I have avoided the issue, as regards such an attempt at classification, by including in the material for the present study only combinations formed with the sixteen prepositional-adverbs *about, across, around* (or *round*), *at, by, down, for, in, off, on, out, over, thru, to, up, with.*

I have, moreover, avoided an equally difficult task by refraining from a thorogoing attempt to classify verb-adverb combinations as either acceptable English or as colloquial and slang. The dictionaries, it is true, give a certain amount of assistance to the student of diction and good taste

in speech; but none the less, correct usage is such an intangible and varying thing that it is practically impossible to determine the social status of each combination and usage. Some, as, for example, *ask for, bow down, cry out, go on, make off, point out,* would unquestionably be accepted by all, tho, in some cases, very careful speakers might prefer to employ single words of more highly specialized meaning, such as *request, bow* or *kneel, exclaim, continue, depart, demonstrate.* Others are more or less thoroly justified by the technical or specialized use to which they are generally put. So we *call up* by telephone, *connect up* with the assistance of plumber or electrician, *kick off* at the beginning of a football game, *lay by* corn at the last plowing, *make up* for the stage, etc. But many are frankly colloquial or even slang, altho only a year will suffice, sometimes, to transfer one from the lower stratum of linguistic society to a place of prominence and good standing. *Carry on,* for example, appeals to all nowadays, since the war has ennobled it, and no one knows what trick of fate may suddenly bring the purist to welcome with open arms such questionable characters as *butt in* 'interfere,' *hold up* 'rob,' *sport up* 'dress up,' etc.

Indeed, if no other justification were to be found for such a study as this, the very realization which comes to even the most superficial observer, of the fluctuating, ever-growing character of the English language should be sufficient to deter one from passing the subject lightly by and should prevent him ever after from making over-arbitrary pronouncements regarding questions of propriety in speech. For when one is brought to realize that the colloquial waif of today may be the respected citizen of tomorrow, he looks somewhat less harshly at the suspect and gives it at least the benefit of a judgment based upon its individual linguistic merits and possibilities. For language is, after all is said, only a medium for the interchange of ideas, not a cultural end.

SECTION II. THEORY AND HISTORY OF VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION IN ENGLISH

1. Most of the discussion, heretofore, of the growth of the verb-adverb combination in English, as well as in the Germanic tongues in general, has been confined to those aspects of the matter which are concerned with sentence-stress. Professor Curme has shown at some length the gradual shifting of usage in the early English from the verb with inseparable prefix to the combination where the particle or so-called separable prefix follows the verb in the sentence.[2] Others have taken up certain phases of the development in briefer studies in an effort to determine the exact influence that sentence-stress and group-accent have had upon the usage.[3] So that the gradual diminution of the use of the verb with inseparable prefix such as still survives in *forgive, foreshadow, outface, outnumber, overtake, overthrow, understand, undertake, withstand,* and a few others, has been examined somewhat in detail. It is to be emphasized, however, that with the dropping of the verb with inseparable prefix as a large and vital factor in the development of the English vocabulary, the part that stress plays in the development of the verb-adverb combination becomes much less, and other factors much more important.

2. There can be no question, as others, notably Professor Curme, have shown, that the tendency to stress an adverbial particle following the verb more or less closely, worked, during the Old English and early Middle English periods, toward the elimination of the verb with unstressed, inseparable particle and the gradual increase of the verb-adverb combination such as we are concerned with in this study. And yet Professor Curme's statement (on p. 321) that "we often find accented adverbs and also prefixes, as *in, up, ut,* etc., after the verb" is likely to give a wrong impression as to the frequency of occurrence of the new usage in the Old English period. In the first 300 lines of the *Beowulf,* for example, I find twenty-five occurrences of the verb with inseparable prefix such as *ofteah* (5), *forgeaf* (17), *onsendon* (45), *forscrifen* (106), *becom* (192), *onleac* (259), etc., while there are only five examples of the verb

[2] G. O. Curme: The Development of Verbal Compounds in Germanic. Paul und Braunes Beiträge 39: 320–361. 1914.

[3] T. O. Harrison: The Separable Prefixes in Anglo-Saxon. Baltimore. 1892. H. Eitrem: Stress in English Verb+Adverb Groups. Englische Studien 32:69–77. 1903. J. Ellinger: Ueber die Betonung der aus Verb+Adverb Wortgruppen. Wien Program. 1910.

used with a separate adverbial modifier of the type under consideration, viz., *up ahafen* (128), *forð gewat* (210), *ut scufon* (215), *up . . . stigon* (224–5), *gewitaþ forð* (291). In an equally long passage of the O. E. *Genesis* occur forty-nine compounds like those above-listed and two combinations, namely, *forð cuman* (122) and *ahof up* (148). In the *Juliana* (Ll. 1–300) I find sixty uses of the compound and a doubtful three of the combination, viz., *up astag* (62), *wiþ þingade* (260) (which is more probably a compound), and *fore stondeð* (277). In Book II, chapters 1 and 2, of Alfred's translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, fifty-four compounds are used as compared with the two combinations, *up . . . gesohte* (94:15–16) and *of cwomon* (96:21). In the first of Aelfric's *Saints' Lives* are seventy-seven compounds, and the four combinations *to gesceapen wæs* (59), *ut blawaþ* (214), *in ateoð* (215), and *on libbað* (216).

In order to make the case as strong as possible for the early development of the verb-adverb combination, I have not listed as compounds any verbs with merely the prefix *ge-*, and, on the other hand, I have listed as combinations examples where the adverb is probably in reality an inseparable prefix, altho the scribe has left a slight space between it and the verb following. Indeed, of the sixteen examples which I have just listed as combinations, only two show the adverbial particle following the verb. So that we may say that in the five Old English monuments under examination occurrences of the verb-adverb combination are practically nil whereas the use of the compound i. e. verb with inseparable prefix is fairly common.

During the Middle English period the development of the verb-adverb combination is much more marked, tho it is not easy to conclude from the varying types of literature available just how far this usage advanced in each century and dialect, just as it would be somewhat difficult even today to ascertain the true popularity of the combination if one were confined to printed language alone. Moreover, the inrush of a multitude of Romanic verbs with inseparable prefixes complicates the matter greatly.

In pp. 8–15 of the *Ancren Riwle* I find fifty-four occurrences of the native compound, and fifteen of the combination such as *etbrec . . . ut* (8:11), *wende ut* (9:9), *smit of* (14:18), etc. In the first 400 lines of the *Owl and Nightingale* the compound occurs fifty times, and the combination only six, with *ut, vorp, on, adun*. In *Dame Siriþ* the proportion is twenty-nine to five, and in *Havelok* it is twelve to three. So far the Romanic verb-compound plays practically no part.

But in the next century in the literature of the more formal sort, especially, the Romanic compound verb is more frequently used than either the older native compound or the newer combination. In five pages

of Mandeville's *Travels* I find eleven occurrences of the native compound, thirty-one of the Romanic, and only four of the verb-adverb combination. In lines 1–230 of the B-version of *Piers Plowman* there are twelve native compounds, eighteen Romanic, and ten combinations. In Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (A 1–500) to fourteen of the native compounds and fifteen of the Romanic only two combinations are to be found contrasted, viz., *ryden out* (45) and *pinche at* (326). The simplicity of the language of Chaucer's *General Prolog* tends, of course, to exclude the more cumbersome compounds, both native and Romanic, and I think we may safely assume that the combination has not yet become so imbedded in the language that Chaucer would use it at all freely. In the prose *Testament of Love,* however, Book I, chapters 1–2, the native compound occurs twenty-three times, the Romanic forty-six, and the combination twelve.

When the fifteenth century is reached, the combination begins to show real strength, altho it is evidently a part of the language of the common man, even as it has been ever since. In the *Ballad of Robin Hood and the Monk,* for example, I find eighteen occurrences of the native compound, not one of the Romanic, and twenty of the verb-adverb combination. On the other hand, in the very formal, indeed, rather forced, language of the first five hundred lines of the Digby play of the *Conversion of St. Paul* the native compound occurs twenty-two times, the Romanic sixty-two, and the combination only fifteen times. Most of the combinations occur in the stage directions or else in the scurrilous conversation of servants.

It seems evident, and I wish to emphasize this point in view of certain conclusions that I shall reach regarding later usage, that the development of the verb-adverb combination would have been much more rapid had it not been weakened for some generations or even centuries, by the adoption into the English of numerous Romanic verbs with inseparable prefixes which drove out the native compounds, and for a time made the newer combination unnecessary. In the formal literature, wherein dialog and the language of the street had little place, the Romanic compound verb came into general acceptance as the proper form, and it is only a comparatively recent reaction against the borrowed element in English which has tended to carry the more plebeian verb-adverb combination to higher planes of literary life.

So, in the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, one finds a great diversity in the use of the combination. In Bale's *Kynge Johan,* Act I, only seven or eight occurrences are to be noted. In *The Witch of Edmonton* about as many of these combinations occur as would be met with in modern good usage. In the Elizabethan comedies, especially, one is likely to find numerous examples. In the dignified Biblical version of

1611 the combination is less frequently encountered, and is usually to be taken literally, as, for example, *enter in, fill up, go on, pluck out, root up,* or else with an intensive or perfective value contributed by the particle, such as is seen in *burn up, cry out, devour up.* The conservatism of the translators of the Holy Scriptures has at all periods tended to avoid any but the most literal of these combinations. And so in the revision of 1882, in Matthew I–XVI, I find only some twenty-two of these, a net increase of four over the King James version.

In more recent times the verb with inseparable prefix has maintained a limited place in English because it has developed thru figurative usage certain fixed values quite decidedly different from the earlier literal meanings, values which could not very well be dispensed with. Sometimes the two elements, prepositional-adverb and verb, are used in both compound and combination; but when this occurs, the one is always figurative, the other usually literal. In other words, the compound is to be regarded as a linguistic fossil, the combination as living, organic, in speech.

It is also interesting to note, in this connection, that the noun or adjective compounded of these two elements is more common at the present time than the verb-compound, and frequently possessed of meanings quite different from those contributed to the verb-compound. Of the sixteen prepositional-adverbs under consideration at least eleven are used more or less frequently in compound nouns or adjectives derived from or modeled after the verb-compound. Examples are *bygone, bystander, downcast, downfall, downpour, downtrodden, forlorn, inborn, inbound, inbred, inroads, intake, offcast, offset, offshoot, offspring, onlooker, onrush, onset, outbreak, outcast, outcome, outcry, outfall, outfit, outlet, output, overbearing, overcast, overflow, overgrown, oversight, overthrow, overwrought, thorofare, upheaval, upkeep, uplift, uproar, upshot, upstart, withdrawal.*

Of all the nouns just listed only eight have accompanying compound verbs and in each case there is some slight irregularity in the correspondence of noun and verb. *Oversight* and *withdrawal* show derivative suffixes, the substantive values of *offset* and *overcast* are quite different from the verbal connotations, *outfit* (the verb) is a late use of *outfit* (the noun), and *overflow* and *overthrow* are comparatively late uses of the verbs as nouns. All the other nouns and adjectives of the list correspond in signification to verb-combinations such as *go by, stand by, cast down, tread down, fall down* rather than to verbs with the inseparable prefixes.

Of the eleven particles used in the above-named noun-compounds, only six, viz., *for, off, out, over, up* and *with* are used in modern verb-compounds. In the more common *for*-compounds *forbear, forbid, forget, forgive, forgo, forsake* and *forswear* the early literal meaning has entirely disappeared and it is not easy to determine the exact contribution of the

prefix to the verb-compound at the present time. In *offset* and *set off* the two values are clearly contrasted and, as noted above, the noun corresponds to the combination rather than to the compound. In most of the verbs still in common use with the prefix *out-*, such as *outbid, outbrave, outdo, outface, outflank, outgrow, out-Herod, outlive,* etc., the prefix contributes to the verb the idea of surpassing or going beyond a fixed time or an opponent, a meaning not normally possessed by the prepositional-adverb when it is used alone or when it appears in a noun-compound such as are noted above.

The verb-prefix *over-* is by far the most active of the group in modern English. It has the usual prepositional value in *overarch, overhang, overlap, overleap, overlook, overrun, oversee, overshadow, overtake, overthrow, overturn,* and perhaps a few other less-commonly used verbs. The preponderatingly active use of it, however, meaning "in excess of an opponent or of that which is fitting," is illustrated in such compounds as *overawe, overbid, overcharge, overdo, overdraw, overeat, overload, overpower, overrule, oversell, overwork.* In *overflow* and *overreach* it might be questioned whether the literal prepositional meaning or the transferred meaning of "in excess" is more strongly felt. Perhaps these two words may be taken as illustrating the process of development of the transferred value from the earlier literal one. At any rate the two uses of *over-* in composition are still strongly enough entrenched in the language so that the nouns and adjectives do not show any marked divergence from the verbs, either in accent or in meaning. It is only when one makes of the compound verb a verb-combination such as *do over, draw over, load over, work over,* that the adverb takes on a new meaning, viz., that of repetition, or in *look over, run over, take over, throw over, turn over,* emphasizes a literal adverbial use which has become slightly obscured in the more figurative usage of the corresponding verb-compounds.

Of the few verbs in general use today compounded with *up-, upend* and *uproot* are used literally; but a transferred meaning must be recognized in *upbraid, uphold* and *upset.* Not one of these can be used as a noun, unless we except *upset,* which is used colloquially with stress on the prefix.

And, finally, *with-,* in the old compounds *withdraw, withhold* and *withstand,* must be regarded as an entirely different word from the modern preposition because, while the preposition has the form of the Old English *wiδ,* it has the value of O. E. *mid,* whereas the prefix *with-* preserves the O. E. meaning of "against." Consequently the contrast of the above-named old compounds with the new combinations *draw with, hold with* and *stand with* is most marked.

Inasmuch as the stress was generally placed upon the prefix of an

O. E. noun compounded with any one of these particles, but upon the verb itself in the verb-compound, it is but natural that the noun-compound should survive with its earlier values when the verb had largely vanished. For the tendency to stress the adverb, which we have already called attention to, found the noun satisfactorily accented where the verb was not. And so it came about that the O. E. verb-compound, in its struggle for existence, either fossilized with certain figurative values, as in *forgive, upset, withhold,* leaving the prefix almost colorless, or else gave to the prefix new and quite different values, as in *outdo, overfeed,* while the noun-compound was left in numerous instances with meanings which could be matched only in the newer verb-adverb combinations, as, for example, *onlooker* and *look on, outcry* and *cry out.*

3. A careful examination of the examples which I have selected as verb-adverb combinations from the literature produced before the sixteenth century brings into prominence quite clearly the fact that for a long time the combination was used in its literal sense, or with a slightly transferred meaning only. Of some ninety-two examples noted in the Middle English literature mentioned above, hardly a dozen could be regarded as strongly figurative. Such combinations as *wende ut, uorþ iladde, smite off, strek out, kairen aboute, come up, ryden out* are really little more than verbs with adverbial modifiers. Moreover, in practically all of the instances where a verb-adverb combination is formed of the elements which enter into a still-existent verb-compound, the combination has the literal value and the compound the figurative. Cf. *offset* and *set off, outgrow* and *grow out, outlive* and *live out, uphold* and *hold up, upset* and *set up.*

4. But when, in the Digby play of the *Conversion of St. Paul,* Seruus says to his fellow of the stables, "Come of a-pase" (line 86), the original literal use of the phrase is scarcely to be conjectured. And when, a little over a century later, in the *Knight of The Burning Pestle,* one finds *let out* 'dismiss,' *laid up* 'saved,' *come by* 'acquire,' the figurative or transferred use of the combination has manifestly assumed a place in the English language quite independent of the literal usage. And intermingled with these figurative combinations are others, also common in modern usage, wherein the verb is used literally but the adverbial particle has a perfective or intensive value somewhat removed from its usual prepositional values, such combinations, for example, as *worn out* 'exhausted,' or *dry up* (those tears).

As I shall attempt to prove later, other influences have become strong in more recent times in increasing the number and importance of the verb-adverb combinations. But for the earlier stages of development two influences must be considered paramount, namely, the tendency to shift the sentence-stress so as to encourage the use of a verb and a following ad-

verbial particle instead of a verb with an inseparable prefix, and the naturally resultant tendency to transfer the combination from a literal to a figurative use which has gradually left certain combinations with meanings quite different from those of the literal originals. This figurative usage is illustrated in such colloquialisms as *blow in* 'spend money,' *buckle down* 'apply oneself with vigor,' *chime in* 'join in a conversation,' *chip in* 'contribute,' *set about* 'begin,' *spruce up* 'dress neatly,' *take off* 'burlesque,' etc.

The figures which I have given[4] for the earlier stages of the development of the verb-adverb combination must not, of course, be taken as exact and final evidence of the strength of the tendency. In the first place, I have included all combinations with *forth,* which I have not included in my study of later combinations. In the earlier period it must be considered because it was a living, active word whereas in modern English it has gradually dropped out of general use. Moreover it has not always been easy to decide whether a prepositional particle should be considered a part of a verb-adverb combination or merely a postpositive preposition. In *Havelok,* for instance, I find:

> Iustises dede he maken newe
> Al Engelond to faren þorw (lines 263–4).

And, finally, as I have found it inadvisable to attempt in the one study a careful history of the growth of the verb-adverb combination in its earlier, literal period and at the same time a thoro-going estimate of its recent use, it has seemed best to deal with the aspects of the study which concern us most today and leave the more careful tracing of its earlier development to some one who will search out more completely the earliest occurrences of the combination and mark as exactly as possible the transitions from the literal to the figurative.

5. I have been influenced in this choice by the fact that the verb-adverb combination seems to be an important element in that "shop-talk" or "English of the common man" which is so much affected by certain of our writers and public speakers. A careful examination of the language of most speakers and writers who are attempting to effect contact with the more poorly trained speaker of English will show numerous verb-adverb combinations of a colloquial or slangy character. And it is interesting to note that the two main objections to many of these bear upon the entire history of the development of the verb-adverb combination. The one objection is that the oft-repeated figurative use of a combination shows the same poor taste, the same giving prominence to that which is striking or fantastic, which, in the matter of dress, the wearing of very gaudy colors might. This is, of course, the objection of the more

[4] See page 11 ff.

conservative mind, and while it serves to keep usage more stable from generation to generation it must always find itself overridden in certain instances because the figurative use of an expression may become so common that it is no longer regarded as figurative, and the original literal connotation may even be lost sight of altogether. So when Mark Antony is made to say, in his oft-quoted funeral oration for Caesar:

> but were I Brutus,
> And Brutus Antony, there were an Antony
> Would *ruffle up* your spirits, and put a tongue
> In every wound of Caesar, that should move
> The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny.[5]

no one, surely, is displeased with the phrase *ruffle up* because of any tantalizing suggestion in it of a present literal meaning, for its figurative meaning 'to destroy the calm of' is frequently met with.

Sometimes the independent development of the literal and the figurative uses of a combination has produced two decidedly different meanings. So *fall down*, used literally, means 'to prostrate oneself,' but figuratively, 'to lessen,' only; *give in* means 'to hand in,' but also 'to submit or yield'; *give out* is, literally, 'to give outward,' but figuratively 'to fail'; *hold up* may mean 'to support' and also 'to rob.'

Indeed, it is the existence at the same time of the literal and the figurative meanings which makes possible many of the puns and plays upon words which are so common in the current newspapers and magazines,[6] and which tends to deter the thoughtful speaker from adopting the figurative expression.

The second objection, one which is founded upon a feeling for the logical in speech rather than upon the mere question of good taste in speech-usage, is directed at the use of redundant, or seemingly redundant, prepositional-adverbs. But even this objection is not strong enough to do away with all unnecessary particles, for while *deliver up* and *devour up* of the *King James Bible* are not often used today, and while the careful speaker of modern English avoids the colloquial *beat up, bunk up, meet up,* etc., yet such redundancies as *bow down, fill up, hatch out, leaf out,* have become so well entrenched in the language that one scarcely thinks it possible to use them otherwise.

---

[5] See Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar*, Act III, Sc. ii.

[6] Such as the following:

> "Do you think you will ever own a car?"
> "Why not? The controlling circumstances are bound to meet."
> "What do you mean?"
> "Autos keep coming down and I keep saving up."
> *Louisville Courier-Journal.*

SECTION III. VALUES OF THE VARIOUS ADVERBIAL PARTICLES

As I have already stated, in the present study I have included only those combinations which are formed with the sixteen prepositional-adverbs *about, across, around* (or *round*), *at, by, down, for, in, off, on, out, over, thru, to, up* and *with*. While, in many of the combinations, these particles retain the meanings ordinarily possessed as prepositions or adverbs, at times the value of the particle differs in combination with the verb from the value which it has as a separate preposition or adverb. And more rarely the particle is so merged with the verb that it seems no longer to have an independent value.

About, across, around (or *round*), *at, by, thru* and *with* have, as a rule, about the same meanings in combination that they possess as prepositions. This is true of *get about, knock about* 'to wander about,' *lay by* 'to save or hoard,' *put by* 'to lay aside or reserve,' *stand by* 'to back or support,' *get across* 'to succeed,' *bring around* 'to resuscitate,' *come round* 'to yield,' *come at* 'to reach or gain,' *get at* 'to reach,' *look at* 'to view,' *carry thru* 'to complete successfully,' *fall thru* 'to fail,' *look thru* 'to examine or inspect,' *pull thru* 'to survive,' *go with* 'to accompany.' So little, indeed, does the value of these differ from that of the prepositions that about the only justification that one might have for listing some of these as verb-adverb combinations is a certain feeling for closeness between verb and particle as in *stand by* or *look thru*, a very uncertain standard by which to select, or else the fact that in such cases as *fall thru* 'fail' and *go with* 'accompany,' a single, simple verb can be substituted for the combination.

In the *for*-combinations *done for* 'tired out, dead,' *go for* 'attack,' *stand for* 'tolerate or permit,' the value of the adverb is rather obscure and in these combinations is well illustrated the one tendency of the verb-adverb combination to swallow up the particle in a derived special meaning.

In combination *down* has two main values. In the more frequently literal combinations such as *bed down* (a horse), *burn down, cut down, get down, kneel down, nail down, ring down* (a curtain), *stoop down*, the particle has a purely directional force. The same value is manifest in numerous combinations with a transferred use such as *back down* 'to recede downward from a position,' *cipher down* (in a contest), *cut down* 'to diminish,' *hand down* 'to leave to one's heirs,' *lay down* 'to make (a law),' *pay down* (money), *spell down* (in a contest), *turn down* 'to reject,' etc. Frequently, however, *down* implies a diminution or complete cessation of a state or action as in *calm down, cool down, live down* (a disgrace), *narrow down, quiet down, shut down, tone down*. In *argue down, call down*

'to reprimand,' *talk down,* and *wear down* it is difficult to determine whether a faint sense of downward motion is suggested, as in the case of *spell down,* where the contestant sits down after his failure, or whether merely the idea of diminution or cessation is contained in the verb-adverb combination. For one can never be entirely certain that a fairly clear-cut figure of speech doesn't still lurk in a seemingly prosaic, often-used verb-adverb combination. To illustrate a little more fully, *run down,* meaning 'to trace successfully,' may recall the details of the chase with the quarry brought to earth, *salt down* may suggest only a culinary process in general or it may suggest placing pickles or meat down in a barrel, or even down in a cellar, *tame down* may bring to mind a rearing horse or other animal, and *write down,* while it usually implies merely dictation, probably with some people recalls a teacher standing above the writer, dictating words or sentences.

The particle *in,* as it is used in the verb-adverb combination, has various shades of meaning altho most of its uses imply penetration from surrounding conditions or circumstances. In *cave in, come in, fall in* (to a hole), *fill in* (a ditch), *shut in,* the ordinary literal value of the preposition is illustrated and the combination is so loose as to be little more than a verb with its adverbial modifier. Other combinations such as *bid in, buy in, call in* (bonds, etc.), *hand in, muster in, take in,* imply a bringing from circumference to center, so to speak, while others, like *blow in* 'to spend (money),' *chime in* 'to join in the conversation,' *chip in* 'to contribute,' *lay in* 'to make provision of,' *pay in, turn in* 'to return (tickets, etc.),' suggest action looking toward a common center or recipient. And, finally, numerous others suggest various phases of meaning which can be most clearly seen by the simple expedient of supplying a logical object for the prepositional particle. So *break in* implies 'to break into harness,' *drop in,* 'to drop into a room or home,' *dig in* 'to dig into a pile of work,' *give in* 'to give into some one's hands,' *set in* 'to set in motion,' etc. As a group, the *in*-combinations are more likely to be figurative, perhaps because the particle has not developed any very appreciable specialized meaning in combination as some of the other particles, notably *down, out, up,* have done.

The adverb *off* contributes several phases of meaning to the verb-adverb combination. Naturally, and often literally, it is used to show separation or departure as in *bite off, break off, chip off, curtain off, cut off, fight off, give off, head off, hold off, knock off* 'to cease work,' *lay off* 'to dismiss (workmen),' *make off* 'to depart,' *shut off, tear off, warn off,* etc. It expresses relief or release in *beg off, cool off, fire off* (a gun), *get off* (a joke), *go off* 'to explode,' *let off* 'to release,' etc. It shows riddance or extermination in *auction off, buy off, call off* 'to revoke,' *die off, drop off* 'to

die,' *kill off, pass off, pawn off, sell off, sign off,* etc. In a few instances, such as in *finish off, hit* (it) *off, pair off, point off, sugar off, taper off,* the particle implies an orderliness or completion which may be regarded as a slight extension of the last two groups. And, finally, there are some combinations of *off* which express removal either from or of the object. So one can *brush off* a coat or the dust adhering to it, *burn off* a field or the grass in it, *check off* the list or the separate items, *clear off* the table or the dishes on it, *dry off* the surface or the moisture, *wash off, wear off,* etc. While, of course, any one of these combinations could be used in a transferred sense, as a whole the group is more often used literally because *off* has developed in combination values which are distinctive enough to justify the combinations as a group.

In the use of *on* as a combining particle, usually either a prepositional or else an adverbial sequent may be assumed. We *catch on* (to a rail or a suggestion), *draw on* gloves (onto the hands), *lay on* a whip (to the back of the culprit), *look on* (to a game), *pile on, try on, turn on,* etc. On the other hand, with *bring on, come on, get on* 'to prosper,' *go on, keep on,* a sequent *-ward* may be assumed. So one really brings a cold *onward,* etc. In other words, *on* is here practically synonymous with *onward,* and the combination is in reality a mere adverbial modification whose presence in this study can best be justified by the fact that each of the examples above-noted can be expressed by a simpler Romance verb, viz., *precipitate* or *cause, advance, prosper, continue.*

In a few cases the contribution of the particle *on* is not so easily determined. For example, in *carry on* 'to misbehave,' *let on* 'to pretend,' *put on* 'to assume or pretend,' and *take on* 'to misbehave, to make an uproar,' the two values may both be present to a certain degree.

With one exception, *out* is the most commonly used of all the particles which we are examining. Moreover its values are, as a rule, clearly distinguished. Its literal use, expressing direction outward or out from, is best illustrated by such combinations as *branch out, broaden out, deal out, hand out, lengthen out, spread out.* It implies removal or separation in numerous instances such as *back out, buy out, cross out, crowd out, keep out, pick out, sell out,* and especially in those verbs pertaining to household activities such as *air out, brush out, clean out, rinse out, wash out, wring out.* Completeness or finality is expressed in a rather large group like *carry out* 'to complete,' *feather out, hammer out, hew out, leaf out, map out, measure out, plan out, win out, work out,* etc. It is not difficult, in most of the combinations of this group, to find a suggestion of the literal in the particle *out,* and yet it is probably true that most speakers feel the completeness or finality of the action rather than direction or separation, which lurks very dimly in the mental background of the speaker if at all.

It is not easy to draw a line between this group and the next, but the inherent meaning of the verb frequently gives to the combination with *out* the idea of openness or publicity which does not necessarily imply completeness. This is true of *blaze out, blossom out, boom out, break out* 'to become prevalent,' *call out* 'to call loudly,' *hatch out, pay out* (money), *ring out, weigh out* (groceries, etc.). And, finally, the idea of direction or removal is carried to the ultimate conception of exhaustion or extinction in *blot out, blow out* 'to extinguish,' *close out* (a stock of goods), *die out, fade out, freeze out, go out* 'to become extinguished,' *peter out* 'to tire out,' *strike out* (especially as a baseball term), *tire out, wear out,* etc.

There are, of course, a few combinations with *out* which have become so commonplace that *out* is almost inexpressive and the verb itself has nearly lost its earlier individuality. Of this sort are *find out* 'to discover,' *give out* 'to fail,' *look out* 'to beware,' *make out* 'to comprehend,' *try out* 'to make a trial of.'

Over, like *down, off* and *out,* shows in combination both the ordinary prepositional value and new values developed specially in combination. The relationship is more loosely that of adverbial modification in the former as illustrated by *blow over, deed over, fork over* 'to deliver,' *get over* 'to recover,' *give over, go over* 'to examine,' *hand over, heal over, knock over, look over* 'to inspect or examine,' *pass over, run over* 'to practise hurriedly,' *take over* 'to assume,' *think over, turn over* 'to surrender,' *win over,* etc. In others *over* implies a repetition of the action, as in *do over, fix over, make over* 'to remake,' *trim over* 'to trim (a hat) anew, *warm over* (food), *work over* 'to rework.'

The fact that verb and adverb are more closely combined in the latter group than in the former is brought out nicely in the case of *make over* and *work over,* which may express both values of *over.* When the former value is expressed, the verb takes the greater stress and the particle is regarded, ordinarily, as a preposition governing the following noun whereas, in the latter use of the particle, the stress shifts to *over* and the combination governs the following noun as its direct object. To *make over* a child means 'to make a great display of affection or admiration,' but to *make-over* a child may mean 'to re-make the entire character of the child.' Likewise to *work over* butter means to work above it while to *work-over* butter is to work it until it assumes an entirely new character.

Combinations with *to* are relatively few and since the Elizabethan period have decreased quite notably. From Shakespeare and his contemporaries or more immediate successors can be quoted such phrases as *go to, lay to, seal to, set to, stand to.* A few are still used commonly in colloquial usage, especially *come to* 'to revive,' *fall to* 'to begin,' *heave to, turn to,* and *pull to, push to* and *put to* when applied to the closing of a door.

The last three illustrate quite well the fact that there is not merely the possibility of understanding or supplying an object to the preposition as in some previously-noted cases, but where the verb is so combined with *to* the phrase is generally felt to be elliptical, perhaps because *to* is so seldom used without an object.

By far the most important prepositional-adverb in modern usage is *up*. It occurs in more than twice as many combinations as the particle *out*, the next in frequency of combination. Moreover it has a wider range of meanings when used in combination.

Naturally one of the most common *up*-combinations is that in which upward motion or motion tending to raise that upon which it acts is expressed. Some of the most familiar combinations are *bank up* (a house, etc.), *bear up* (under sorrow), *belch up, blaze up, bolster up, brick up* (a well), *flame up, flare up, flash up, fly up* (figuratively, of a person), *foam up, heave up* 'to vomit,' *kick up, lap up, lay up* 'to save,' *pick up, pile up, post up, prick up* (of an animal's ears), *puff up, raise up, rise up, rouse up, run up* (a flag), *soak up, spade up, spring up, stack up, stand up, stay up, string up* (especially 'to hang'), *suck up, swallow up, sweep up, swell up, tack up, take up* (literally, anything, figuratively, a subject), *throw up, well up*. Of course *up* can be thus used, literally, with many other verbs of motion, but in the above list the meaning of the simple verb makes the use of the particle largely unnecessary, and yet usage makes it almost, indeed, in some instances, quite, obligatory. For example, a plant generally *springs up*, not just springs, a person *stands up* when he rises to a standing position, etc.

In a closely allied group of *up*-combinations there is possibly a lingering idea of upward motion tho, as a rule, the combination is figurative, or, if it is literal, the particle has acquired a different significance. We *add up* (figures), *balance up, bid up* (at an auction), *blow up* 'to censure or boast,' *brace up* 'to show fortitude,' *call up* (by telephone), *chalk up* 'to charge to one's account,' *check up, cheer up, chirk up, charge up, choose up* (sides for a contest), *cough up* 'to pay,' *count up, crack up* 'to extol,' *dig up* 'to pay,' *dish up, figure up, fill up, fire up* (a furnace), *foot up* (a column of figures), *ginger up, grow up, hang up* 'to postpone or delay,' *jolly up* 'to cheer,' *keep up* 'to maintain,' *key up, live up* (to a certain standard), *load up* (applied to a drunken man), *loom up, mop up* (a floor), *nerve up, offer up, paste up, pluck up* (courage), *perk up, praise up, ring up, set up* (the treats), *shake up, sign up* (for a baseball team), *slip up* 'to be disappointed,' *snatch up, spunk up* 'to show spunk,' *stick up* (for some one or for one's rights), *stir up* 'to rouse,' *sum up, trip up, wake up, whoop* (it) *up*, 'to cause a disturbance.'

In a few combinations *up* helps to express forward motion or the con-

trary. Under this head I should place *back up, hit* (it) *up, hurry up, jog up, let up* 'to cease,' *move up, prod up, pull up* 'to move forward,' *set up* (a howl), *slack* or *slacken up, slow up, speed up, spur up, start up, steam up, tune up* 'to begin to sing or play,' *whip up.*

Up is also used in expressing motion to a certain position or standard. This idea of a definite end of the act seems to prevail in the combinations *bring up* (the rear-guard), *catch up* 'to overtake,' *connect up* (pipes, wires, etc.), *cuddle up, even up, fetch up, follow up* (a clew), *grade up* (applied to fruit, etc.), *join up* (pipes, wires, etc.), *lead up* (to a subject), *line up* (a body of men), *link up, match up, measure up, meet up* 'to meet,' *pull up* 'to stop a horse,' *rein up, size up* 'to estimate or evaluate,' *trace up, track up.* Perhaps the difference between these combinations and those of the group immediately preceding lies rather in the verb than in any value contributed by the particle. It is *meet* that implies motion to a certain position rather than *up.* But the finality of the action is certainly suggested by the particle.

A closely related idea is that of bringing into prominence or consideration, as shown in such combinations as *act up* 'to behave in an unseemly manner,' *ante up, cut up* 'to play pranks,' *divide up, give up* 'to surrender,' *hunt up, look up* 'to look for and find,' *open up, own up, pipe up, render up, scare up* 'to find,' *serve up, show up, speak up, strike up* 'to begin music,' *study up, think up, throw up* 'to recall tauntingly,' *turn up* 'to appear,' *whack up* 'to divide,' *write up, yield up.*

In still another group of these combinations the idea of making tight or secure seems to combine the locative idea of the two preceding groups with the perfective value which we shall notice a little later. Examples of this are *bind up, board up* (a window, etc.), *bottle up, box up, buckle up, bundle up, button up, cage up, close up, coop up, cork up, cover up, do up* 'to wrap,' *fasten up, gird up, head up* (a barrel), *heal up, hook up* (a dress), *house up, hush up, lace up* (a shoe), *lock up, muffle up, nail up* (a box), *patch up, plug up* (a hole), *rock up, rope up* (a trunk), *screw up, seal up, send up* 'to imprison in a penitentiary,' *sew up, shut up, solder up, stop up* (a hole), *strap up* (a trunk), *tie up* (a bundle), *tighten up, wall up, wrap up.*

Closely akin to this is the idea of bringing together which *up* gives to the following combinations: *bunch up, buy up, coil up, collect up, double up, drum up* (trade), *fold up, gather up, heap up, hoard up, huddle up, hunch up, make up* (a collection), *muster up, pack up, pen up, pucker up, rake up, roll up, round up* (cattle), *sack up, save up, scoop up, scrape up, stock up, store up, take up* (a collection), *wind up* (string, etc.).

The most common combination of all, however, is that in which *up* has a perfective value, lending to the verb with which it is combined the idea of 'bringing to or out of a certain condition.' The verbs of this group

are for the most part highly specialized in meaning so that the effect of the combination, especially when a past participial form of the verb is used, is essentially adjectival. One may *work up* an entertainment, for example, but we describe a person as *worked up* over something who is in a state of excitement or anxiety. With the exception of the use of *up* in its regular adverbial sense of elevation or upward motion this is the most common and most active combining function of the particle. Hence the following list cannot be regarded as complete since *up* can be used in the perfective sense with almost any descriptive verb. The most common combinations are: *ball up* 'to confuse,' *bang up* 'to batter up,' *batter up, beat up, black up, blister up, botch up, brighten up, bruise up, brush up, build up* (a residence district), *bung up* (in the phrase *all bunged up*), *cake up, carve up, char up, clean up, clear up, clog up, cloud up, clutter up, color up* 'to blush,' *cook up, cram up* (for an examination), *cripple up, curl up* (sometimes literally), *daub up, dent up, do up* 'to wash and iron clothes,' also 'to exhaust a person,' *dress up, dust up, fatten up, fit up, fix up* 'to adorn,' *flesh up* 'to put on flesh,' *flush up, fluster up, freeze up* (but *thaw out*), *freshen up, fuss up* 'to dress with care,' *grease up, gum up, harness up, hash up, heat up* (but *cool off*), *hitch up, jam up, jumble up, kink up, level up, light up, limber up, litter up, loosen up, mar up, mark up, mash up, mess up, mix up, muddy up, muddle up, muss up, nick up, paste up, peck up, peel up, plow up* (a field), *polish up, post up* 'to become familiar with a subject,' *powder up, read up, rest up, ripen up, roil up, rub up, rust up, scratch up, scuff up, shape up, shine up, skin up, slash up, slick up, slosh up, smear up, smell up, smoke up, smooth up, snarl up, sober up, spatter up, splash up, splinter up, sport up* 'to dress up,' *spot up, spruce up* 'to dress up,' *squash up, starch up, steam up,* 'to cover with steam,' *stick up, stove up* (participle), *streak up, stuff up, tangle up, tank up* 'to drink heavily,' *thicken up, tidy up, tighten up, tog up* 'to dress up,' *touch up, track up* (a clean floor), *trim up, twist up, warm up, wash up, wet up, wise up* 'to make or become informed,' *wither up.*

Hardly to be classed with any of the preceding is the expression *pass up* (some one) meaning 'to pass without recognizing.' Also it is rather difficult to classify *put up with* 'to lodge with' and 'to tolerate.'

It will be observed that my arrangement of these ten groups emphasizes the tendency to get away from the earlier, literal meaning of *up* and to assume more and more the intensive function, or perfective function, as exemplified in groups 7 and 8. This very fact of an ever-growing tendency in the development of *up* in combination will help to explain the popularity of the *up*-combinations as well as the fact of a greater number of colloquialisms in the list. It will, furthermore, present in clearer light the difficulties of attempting to distinguish colloquial and slang combinations from those generally accepted as good English.

SECTION IV. GENERAL EFFECTS OF COMBINATION

A. Syntactical.

1. In some instances a verb ordinarily intransitive becomes transitive thru the addition of the particle. Examples of this change in syntactical relations are *bawl out* 'to name a person publicly,' *come by* 'to acquire,' *cough up* 'to pay,' *drum up* (trade), *look over* or *up, point out, run down* 'to disparage,' *talk over, work out* (a problem), *work up,* etc.

2. A much larger number of verbs, ordinarily transitive, become intransitive by the addition of the particle. Examples are: *beg off, black up, brace up, bundle up, catch on* or *up, cheer up, clean up, clear out* 'to depart,' *clear up* (of the weather), *cover up, doctor up, dope up, draw up* 'to stop,' *fire up, fix up* 'to dress up,' *get about, get down* or *up* 'to descend or ascend,' *give in* or *up* 'to yield or submit,' *hold off* or *out, hold up* 'to come to a stop,' *keep out, knock off, let down* 'to relax,' *let up* 'to cease,' *light out* 'to depart hastily,' *light up, make out* 'to succeed,' *make off* 'to depart,' *make up* 'to become reconciled,' *own up, pan out, pick up* 'to improve,' *pile off* or *on, pull thru* 'to recover,' *pull out* 'to depart,' *pull up, put up* 'to lodge,' 'to pay,' and 'to tolerate' (with at, for, or with), *prove up* (on land), *quiet down, ring off, set in, set out* 'to depart or make a start,' *show off, shut down* or *up, watch out.* In many of these, no doubt, a reflexive object is understood so that, strictly speaking, they are intransitive in form only. So, for instance, *black up* and *clean up* imply 'to black up or to clean up oneself.' Of course some of the combinations in this list may be used transitively also, but the point to be emphasized here is that the addition of the particle to the simple verb has made possible the use of the combination intransitively whereas the simple verb can not be so used.

3. Again, in a number of instances, the object of the combination is, or may be, of a very different character from that of the simple verb. For example, one can:

argue a case	but	*argue down* an opponent,
burn a paper	"	*burn off* a field,
buy a house	"	*buy off* or *out* a person,
clean a room	"	*clean out* its contents,
dig a hole	"	*dig out* or *up* a plant,
do work	"	*do up* a garment or a person,
live a life	"	*live down* a disgrace,
lock a door	"	*lock in* or *out* or *up* a person,
mop a floor	"	*mop up* the water on it,

plow a field	"	*plow up* a snake,
run a machine	"	*run down* a person,
shut a door	"	*shut in* or *out* or *up* a person,
sign a paper	"	*sign off* or *away* property,
smoke a cigar	"	*smoke out* a person,
turn a faucet	"	*turn on* or *off* the water,
wring a garment	"	*wring out* the water.

In a few cases the combination does not ordinarily take as its object a noun, but a substantive clause. So, while Dekker could write "to *find out* the murderer" (*Witch of Edmonton IV, ii*), today one would be more likely to say "to *find out* who the murderer is."

4. While the use of a verb of active form with the signification or connotation of a passive verb is general and by no means limited to verb-adverb combinations, none the less the combination seems to lend itself to such usage rather freely. A bill will *figure up* to a certain amount, dirt on a garment will *brush off* or *clean off* or *rub off*, a chair *folds up*, fresh bone will *grind up* easily, school *lets out*, a piece of cloth will *make up* nicely, a sleeping person will *rouse up*, a clock *winds up* easily, a plan *works out* well, material *works up* well, etc. This use of an active verb as a passive is especially characteristic of those verb-adverb combinations formed with the perfective *up*, such combinations as *cake up, clog up, cook up, dent up, kink up; scuff up, streak up*, etc.

B. Semasiological.

1. As would be expected, the most common semasiological effect of combining a verb with a prepositional-adverb is to give to the meaning of the verb the modification usually effected by the adverb. In each of the following combinations, for example, the particle has a distinct adverbial personality: *back off, carry thru, clean out, cut off, dish out* or *up, double up, fall out, hang up, hold over, jot down, mark out*, etc.

2. Of almost equal importance in its semasiological effect is the addition of the particle as a perfective or intensive. Since examples of this usage have been given already for the various particles, only a few general illustrations need be given here, viz., *batter up, bleach out, break up* or *down, clean out, cool off, dry up, dust up, feather out, hurry up, lengthen out, match up, miss out, quiet down, rot out*, etc.

3. In a large number of cases the combination gives a meaning quite different from that of the simple verb. As a rule this is due to the fact that an earlier figurative meaning has prevailed while the literal meaning has been neglected. Examples are: *ball up* 'to confuse,' *blow in* 'to spend,' *bring about* 'to cause or accomplish,' *catch on* 'to comprehend,' *come*

about 'to happen,' *crack up* 'to extol,' *dig out* 'to depart,' *do up* 'to exhaust,' *dry up* 'to be silent,' *fall out* 'to disagree,' *fix over* 'to repair,' *fuss up* 'to adorn oneself,' *get over* 'to recover,' *give out* 'to become exhausted,' *go off* 'to explode,' *hold on* 'to stop,' *keep on* 'to continue,' *let on* 'to pretend,' *make out* 'to understand,' *pass up* 'to ignore,' *play out* 'to become exhausted,' *put up with* 'to tolerate,' *take off* 'to imitate,' etc.

4. The objection of the purist that in many instances the particle is unnecessary or, as it has been characterized, parasitical, does seem to be more or less justifiable in some cases. And yet I should hesitate to name a single combination as an example of redundancy since I believe that the speaker almost always feels a nice distinction even tho his sense of the logical tells him that the particle should be quite unnecessary. The particle has been added in the first place to give emphasis, or perhaps to round out the speech rhythm by the interpolation of a syllable; but once having done this, we proceed to acquire a feeling that the simple verb can not express quite what the compound does. So we say, for example, *add up, air out, belch up, bow down, bulge out, bunk up, cloud up, deal out, fall down, fill up, flatten out, fold up, hatch out, hurry up, kneel down, leak out, meet up, pile up, rise up, swell up, taper off, wake up,* etc., despite the fact that one can not very well *bow* except *down,* nor *pile* wood except *up,* nor can a chicken *hatch* otherwise than *out.* Yet we feel a difference between *bowing* and *bowing down, kneeling* and *kneeling down, leaking* and *leaking out.*

5. Finally, a few verb-adverb combinations have assumed special meanings which are due, not to any potential values of verb or adverb, but to the fact that they have been used in special contexts so long and so exclusively that they have become unusually suggestive to those who are wont to use them. So *bid in,* according to *Webster,* implies that the present owner buys back his own property at auction; *bind out* usually applies to apprenticing; to *brick up* is to line something, usually a well, with brick; we *call up* usually by telephone; one *crams up* for an examination; *die off* or *out* is rarely applied to an individual but to a collection or community; *kick off* is a football term; the farmer *lays by* his corn when he plows it for the last time; we still feel that *offer up* is suggestive of sacrifice; one *plucks up* courage, principally.

SECTION V. PECULIARITIES OF COMBINATION

1. It is very noticeable that the verbs that enter into these combinations are largely monosyllables. Out of 826 combinations specially examined only ninety-seven have dissyllabic verbs. And of these only three bear the accent on the last syllable, namely, *collect (up), connect (up), divide (up)*. The others end in very weak syllables, chiefly the vocalic consonants *l, m, n, r,* less often in *-ish* or *-y*.

Verbs in *-r*	e. g.	*barter, feather*	27
" " *-le*	"	*settle, cripple*	24
" " *-n*	"	*broaden, button*	19
" " *-y*	"	*carry, hurry*	6
" " *-sh*	"	*finish, polish*	3
" " *-ure*	"	*measure, treasure*	3
Miscellaneous	"	*ante, blossom, harness*	15
			97

I have noted only one trisyllabic verb in combination, namely, *partition (off)*.

2. Of the monosyllabic verbs which have been tabulated for the foregoing paragraph about 18 per cent are of non-Teutonic origin, such as, for example, *calm (down), palm (off), air (out), map (out), add. (up), check (up)*, etc.; of the dissyllabic verbs in combination about 55 per cent are non-Teutonic, as, for example, *quiet (down), finish (off), figure (out), balance (up), level (up), offer (up)*, etc.

The reasons for the predominance of native, monosyllabic verbs in combination are clear, I am sure. In the first place, they are not only less cumbersome in the combining, but for the sake of a certain speech rhythm they seem to call for weaker syllables to accompany them. Then again the native Teutonic verbs (and I include those of Scandinavian origin) are used more commonly, as a rule, and are more likely to be familiar to the speaker possessed of a limited vocabulary.

3. Some three or four dozen of the verbs entering into these combinations are, curiously enough, seldom or never used without the particle. Such, for example, are *auction off, cave in, chirk up, clutter up, coop up, dole out, drum up, even up, feather out, ginger up, hedge in, jot down, keel over, limber up, parcel out, peter out, plank down* 'to pay,' etc. Almost as many others, moreover, such as *brace up, brush up, calm down, cloud up, keep in* or *out, light up*,[1] are used intransitively only in combination. All

[1] When *keep* and *light* are applied to fruit and fuel, for example, they are not intransitive so much as passive in signification.

of which goes to show that while from some verb-adverb combinations the particle might be spared, from numerous others it can by no means be dropped.

4. To revert to the question of the influence which sentence-stress has upon the use of the verb-adverb combination, it is interesting to note that in this connection, just as in some others, certain definite rules have been adopted for the arrangement of the word-group. A pronominal object almost always intervenes between the verb and the particle in modern English. I find, for example, the following:

> immediately upon *finding* this *out.—Wallingford, 331.*
> tell him to *git* himself *up* regardless.—*H. Finn, 223.*
> when I *hunted* him *out.—Iron Heel, 43.*
> I couldn't *make* it *out.—H. Finn, 22.*

Otherwise the particle usually follows the verb immediately and is followed by the object, whether it be a noun or a substantive phrase or clause:

He's *figuring up* his bank account today.—*Wallingford, 273.*

It was hard to *find out* who was responsible for any given bad conditions.—*Four Years, 131.*

We *fixed up* a short forked stick.—*H. Finn, 90.*

Drop in and *let on* to be a stranger.—*H. Finn, 319.*

Even as early as the Tudor period of English history these rules of order were generally adhered to altho the exceptions were somewhat more frequent than at the present time. For Wyclif's "thei schuln *take* you" (Matt. 10:17) Tyndale has "*deliver* you *up*" and the King James version follows Tyndale's phrasing. Bale writes "Evyn to dewore her and *eat* her *upp* attonnys" (Kynge Johan 427), and "To *gyve up* his crowne" (Do. 1006), but Dekker has "Rats and foul maladies *eat up* thee and thine" *(Witch of Edmonton, IV, i),* "Why should I not walk hand in hand with Death, To *find* my love *out" (Do., IV, ii),* and "Have I *given up* myself to thy black lust" *(Do., V, i).* Even earlier yet Mandeville's *Travels* reads: "they *do off* both hosen and shoon" (p. 40) and "every good Christian man . . . should pain him . . . to chase out all the misbelieving men" (p. 4).

Occasionally, when the noun object is short, or when the speaker wishes to emphasize the particle slightly, the object intervenes. So Mark Twain writes, "s'pose you'd 'a' done right and *give* Jim *up" (H. Finn, 127),* and "I had *hunted* the place *over" (H. Finn, 34).*

Sometimes, moreover, the particle is further emphasized by the interpolation of an adverb along with the pronominal object as when, for example, one of Chester's characters says, "We can *fix* you all *up" (Walling-*

ford, 135). Other examples are *keep right on, lay not up* for yourselves treasures *(King James Bible, Matt. 6:19).*

In a few instances the impersonal pronoun *it* intervenes, but is itself so colorless that the unity of the verb-adverb combination is hardly affected at all. This is true of such expressions as *to come it over* (someone), *to hit it up* 'to hasten,' *to hit it off* 'to agree,' *to stick it out* 'to persevere,' *to whoop it up,* etc.

5. As has already been noted, the English verb-adverb combination is frequently synonymous with, or nearly synonymous with, a Romanic verb. A careful examination of a fairly generous number of these equivalents brings into prominence the fact that the English combination is sometimes a mere translation of the idea of the Latin verb, but at other times it attempts to reproduce by its two elements the stem and prefix of a Latin compound verb, and at other times it is even a figurative reproduction of some Latin verb.

In the first group might be placed such combinations as:

ask for	request	*come in*	enter
bear out	corroborate	*come around*	acquiesce
blow out	extinguish	*crumble up*	disintegrate
break down	collapse	*dig up*	exhume
bring around	resuscitate	*fed up*	satiated
come by	acquire	*get down*	descend
		give in	acquiesce
		let in	admit
		make out	distinguish
		own up	confess

In a second group are those which show a fairly good translation of the Latin basic verb but not always so good a reproduction of the prefix, as, for example:

blow up	inflate	*get round*	circumvent
bring in	introduce	*light up*	illuminate
bring up	suggest	*put off*	postpone
call off	revoke	*put on*	assume
call out	evoke	*put out*	extinguish
catch on	apprehend	*take in*	deceive
deal out	distribute	*take up*	assume
gather up	collect		

And, finally, some verb-adverb combinations express in a figurative and often more picturesque way the idea expressed rather more tamely by the Latin derivative. Examples are:

cut down	diminish	*pick up*	acquire
cut out	eliminate	*pull thru*	recover
fall off	diminish	*stand by*	support
fork over	deliver	*stir up*	excite
fall thru	fail	*tear down*	demolish
hold on	delay	*wear out*	exhaust
go thru	search	*wind up*	conclude
pan out	result	*wipe out*	obliterate

It is to the somewhat showy, because figurative, combinations of this third group that the strongest objection is made by the purist.

6. Occasionally the verb-combination comprises two adverbial particles instead of just one. So one finds:

catch up with 'to overtake'	*keep on with* 'to continue'
fall in with 'to accept'	*put up with* 'to tolerate'
get on with 'to harmonize'	*sneak up on* 'to approach stealthily'
get thru with 'to finish'	*stand up for* 'to defend'
go in for 'to study, cultivate'	*stick up for* 'to defend'
go over to 'to join'	

Of course, it may be argued that the second particle is a preposition governing the following substantive. But because the entire phrase can be translated by a single, simple verb, and because the entire phrase functions as a single verb, there is a certain amount of justification for treating the above-named combinations as double combinations.

SECTION VI. BEGINNINGS AND CAUSES OF COMBINATION

While I have little doubt that these combinations of special meaning were at the outset largely figurative, as I have already stated,[8] I feel equally certain that the growth of the tendency to form them is due in great measure to four quite different causes. In many instances a desire to strengthen or emphasize the idea expressed by a simple verb causes the speaker to add such a particle as *out* or *up*, as, for example, in the expressions *stretch out, pay up*, etc. Then, again, the desire to vary the expression of an idea leads to the combination of other verbs of similar meaning with the same particle. Several combinations having similar meanings develop, and after these have come to be regarded as more or less of a category, new combinations are formed by analogy, or as one might term it, by a sort of categorical influence. So for *add up* one may say *count up, figure up, foot up, reckon up* or *sum up;* for *hand over* it is possible to substitute *fork over, pass over* or *pony over;* for *doctor up, dope up* or *dose up;* for *link up, connect up* or *join up;* for *hoard up, lay up, save up* or *treasure up*. Again, as I have suggested above, a desire for a certain rhythmic effect in our speech seems to be responsible for the introduction of a particle of different stress after a monosyllabic verb. How far this is true it is difficult to determine, but in certain combinations such as *slow up, hush up, lead off, look out,* it would seem that the particle is added to make of the verb a sort of trochee. And, finally, mere linguistic laziness seems to be responsible for the popularity of many of these combinations. It is so much easier to combine a dozen or fifteen well-known prepositional-adverbs with the simpler and more familiar verbs than it is to keep in mind a special polysyllabic verb for each different concept. There is little doubt which, of the following pairs of verbs, the average speaker would choose:

bear out.....corroborate	*keep on*.....continue
bring about.....effect	*look over*.....examine
bring on.....precipitate	*make out*.....comprehend
bring up.....rear	*put out*.....extinguish
fit up.....furnish, equip	*use up*.....exhaust
find out.....discover	*watch out*.....beware

Much of the difference, indeed, between the speech of the majority of those who pretend to be fairly well educated and of the few who take a real pride in the precision and dignity of their English lies in the use, on

[8] See page 16.

the one hand, of the verb-adverb combination and, on the other, of the less common but more exact synonym.

Furthermore, to go one step farther, one can generally distinguish between the average man of fairly good education and the indifferent user of English by his choice in such a list as the following:

ball up	confuse	*get on*	prosper
blow in	spend	*hang out*	reside
call down	censure, rebuke	*hold up*	rob
call off	cancel	*jack up*	reprove
catch on	comprehend	*jolly up*	encourage
chip in	contribute	*knock off*	cease work
cough up	pay	*let down*	relax
dig in	apply oneself	*let on*	pretend
do up	exhaust	*make out*	understand
fizzle out	fail	*muddle up*	confuse
fix up	improve, furnish	*pull out*	depart

A hasty survey of the 826 combinations specially examined shows at least 110 which could at times be replaced to advantage by more highly specialized verbs. And yet that by no means implies that so large a proportion of our verb-adverb combinations could be eliminated since many of them are possessed of a variety of meanings, as already noticed. No doubt any one who examines thoughtfully the lists of pairs which I have just given will at times feel inclined to question the pair just because the meaning of the combination must often be expressed by some other simple verb than the one which stands opposite it in the list.

SECTION VII. RESULTS OF THE INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF COMBINATIONS

The ever-increasing tendency to utilize the verb-adverb combination is resulting in at least three very important changes in the character of the English vocabulary. In the first place, an inspection of the articles in Webster's *New International Dictionary* which treat of our most common verbs of native origin such as *back, blow, break, bring, call, come, fall, get, give, go, hold, lay, let, make, put, run, set, take, turn* and *work,* will reveal an amazing wealth of meanings and uses in combination. And it must be borne in mind that no dictionary has been able to record all the variety of colloquial and slang adaptations of the combinations. In the list of combinations and meanings which I have compiled from recent dictionaries and various books illustrating modern colloquial English, the twenty verbs above-named enter into 155 different combinations with at least 600 fairly distinct significations or uses.

On the average each of these verbs is combined with seven or eight out of the sixteen particles under consideration. *Get,* as might be expected, leads with fourteen such combinations, viz., *get about, get across, get at, get by, get down, get in, get off, get on, get on with, get round, get thru, get thru with, get to* and *get up. Go* is next with thirteen combinations, *come* and *put* each with twelve, *lay* and *take* each with nine, *fall, run, turn* with eight, and the rest with fewer.

These combinations, moreover, are susceptible of an amazing number of uses and phases of meaning. *Take* leads with about sixty-four,[9] *put* comes next with sixty-three, *go* has sixty-one, then comes *get* with forty-seven, *turn* with forty-one, *lay* with forty, *set* with thirty-seven, *run* with thirty-four, *make* with thirty-two, *fall* with thirty, and the others of the list with fewer.

The range of meaning and the variety of uses to be found in special combinations are at times remarkable. *Make up* is capable of at least sixteen, while *put out, take up* and *set up* show fifteen apiece, *get up* twelve, *take in* and *turn out* eleven each, *go thru* and *put up,* ten, etc.

For example, *make up* may mean, according to Webster's *Dictionary:*

1. To build or construct. *Obsol.*

2. To compose, to constitute. "The twenty-five states . . . which *make up* the German Empire."—*Four Years, 35.*

3. To compose, draw up or compile. "*Making up* a list of names."—*Sixes and Sevens, 106.*

[9] These figures are approximate, of course.

4. To invent or concoct. "*Make* me *up* a romantic name," or "*Make up* a story."

5. To form into; to *wrap* or to *fasten up*, as, to *make up* a parcel.

6. To form by an assembling or arranging of parts. "A nigger only *makes up* the feather-bed."—*H. Finn, 247.*

7. To prepare; arrange; adjust; as, to *make up* accounts; also, to distort the features; as, to *make up* a face.

8. Print. To arrange set type (in pages, columns, etc.) for printing.

9. To complete; to fill or close up; to bring up to, as, a dollar is wanted to *make up* the requisite sum.

10. To compensate for; to make good; to atone (for).

11. To dress, paint, etc., for a part, as one to be acted on the stage.

12. To reconcile; to become reconciled, or friendly.

13. To settle or arrange mentally; to decide. To *make up* one's mind.

14. To advance or go (to or into); as, a suspicious boat *made up* to us.

15. To pay addresses (to); to make love (to). *Dial.* or *Slang.*

16. To get into a condition for marketing; said of an animal.

If one considers the use of *out* in such combinations as *bleach out, blot out, cut out, fizzle out,* or the perfective *up* in *mix up, muss up, scrub up, sober up,* etc., he can not fail to appreciate the fact that the number of these combinations is increasing rapidly.

A second result of this growing tendency to combine is the increase of synonymous or nearly synonymous combinations. In a number of cases usage has not yet fixed upon any one phrase, and so it is possible to combine a verb with one of two or more adverbs to produce the same general effect. I say 'general effect' because it must be admitted that in most cases one feels that a slight difference in meaning is developing. A rather interesting example of this tendency to differentiate is shown in a statement in Oman's *England before the Norman Conquest,* p. 489: "Thanks be to God, the army had not utterly *broken down* the English nation," writes the chronicler at this moment. "Instead it had been itself *broken up.*" Perhaps in the case of *back down* or *up,* and *burn down* or *up,* the difference is ordinarily negligible. But if *broken down* and *broken up* are used to describe an individual, the implication differs very decidedly. One who is *badly broken down* is losing his power of resistance, bodily or mentally, whereas one who is *all broken up* over something is in great sorrow, or is grieving. To *buy in* and *buy up* mean, in a general way, the same, but usually suggest in themselves quite different conditions of purchase. One may *buy in* (or *bid in*) articles of his own which are being offered for sale at auction, whereas to *buy up* implies a deliberate effort to purchase all

available property of a certain kind. Roads may *dry off* or *dry up*, but a talkative person can only be told to *dry up*. In a class with the above examples are, also:

brush out or *up*	*follow out* or *up*
close down or *up*	*freeze over* or *up*
cloud over or *up*	*give in* or *up*
cool down or *off*	*heal over* or *up*
die off or *out*	*hunt up* or *out*
eat down or *up*	*lock in* or *up*
shut down or *up*	*slow down* or *up*
speak out or *up*	*study out* or *up*
talk out or *up*	*tog out* or *up*

It must be reiterated, however, that while these combinations may be used interchangeably under certain circumstances, they can not be so used under all conditions. One can let an engine *cool down* or *off*, but when these phrases are applied to a human being, a very nice distinction is felt. A person *cools off* if he has become physically warm, but he *cools down* if mentally 'heated up' or aroused. The one phrase is literal, the other is figurative.

The context determines, generally, whether one can use the different particles interchangeably or use only one of them. One can *clean out* or *clean up* a room, altho these phrases are synonymous only in a very general way, for *out* has a certain directional force which suggests the removal of debris or unnecessary articles, while *up* lends to the combination a perfective force.

In other words, the prepositional-adverb very seldom loses its adverbial personality so completely that it makes no difference in the use of the combination. Such a state of indifference is perhaps most nearly attained in such combinations as *give in* or *give up* (intrans.), *slow down* or *slow up*, *speak out* or *speak up*, *talk out* or *talk up*.

The third, and very marked, change which the multiplication of the verb-adverb combinations has been effecting in the English vocabulary is the one which offers most material for discussion. For in the gradual—of late rather rapid—increase in the use of these combinations, a large number of simple verbs of more highly specialized meaning are being crowded out of general use. Perhaps this can be most definitely illustrated by turning again to the first ten of the twenty verbs already studied.[10] Some of the most obvious substitutions in ordinary usage are:

[10] See page 35 ff.

back up	for	support or uphold
blow in	"	spend
blow out	"	extinguish
blow up	"	explode; inflate; scold; praise extravagantly
break in	"	interrupt
bring about	"	effect
bring on	"	cause or precipitate
bring round	"	resuscitate
bring up	"	train; rear; suggest
call down	"	rebuke, censure
call off	"	revoke
call out	"	evoke, elicit
call up	"	invoke
come about	"	happen
come across	"	meet or experience; acquiesce or agree to
come by	"	acquire or secure possession of
come around	"	yield or acquiesce; revive
come to	"	regain consciousness
fall down	"	fail (applicable to a person)
fall out	"	quarrel, disagree
fall thru	"	fail (applicable to a project or undertaking)
get about	"	begin
get across	"	succeed
get at	"	reach, gain access to
get off	"	depart
get on	"	succeed, prosper
get out	"	leave, depart
get round	"	circumvent, cajole, wheedle, evade
get thru	"	finish
get up	"	plan; array oneself; arise
give in	"	acquiesce, submit, yield
give off	"	emit
give out	"	issue (trans.); fail
give up	"	relinquish, surrender, renounce, devote
go about	"	attend to
go in	"	enter
go off	"	discharge, explode
go on	"	continue, happen; rant
go over	"	inspect; join
go thru	"	search

It would, of course, be rash for any one to attempt to say just how many of these simple equivalents have been lost from general usage, because it would be difficult to make a satisfactory survey of the use of the verb-adverb combination in English-speaking society as a whole. How far up the scale of intellectual refinement and training has it penetrated? No one can say with assurance because of the difficulty of registering accurately oral usage. Many a college professor or other public speaker uses the combination in his ordinary conversation, and even in lecturing, but shifts to a more formal, less colloquial, vocabulary the moment he begins to write. One can not be sure that the simpler equivalent has been crowded out of the vocabulary until sufficient time shall have elapsed to show conclusively the loss of the word.

On the whole I believe there is no denying that certain of the Latin loan-verbs which were fairly familiar a generation or two ago are being used less and less by the man of professed higher education. How many people would ordinarily use *butt in* instead of *intrude* or *interfere, call off* instead of *cancel, done up* in place of *exhausted, fix up* for *furnish* or *improve, get on* for *prosper, let down* for *relax,* etc.?

SECTION VIII. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Any one who is deeply interested in maintaining the highest possible standards of English usage cannot fail to be impressed by the strength of this growing tendency in English, nor can he avoid weighing the merits and weaknesses of the practice. Something can be said both for the encouragement of the use of the verb-adverb combination, and against it.

1. The development of these combinations is essentially a process of the common, relatively uneducated, mind; the verbs and the combining particles, as I have already shown, are mainly of native, Anglo-Saxon stock and are in daily use by all classes of English-speaking people. On the other hand, the words that are being displaced, such as, for example, *collapse* (break down), *comprehend* (catch on), *eliminate* (cut out), *issue* (give out), etc., were introduced into the language, for the most part, through scholarly influence. Many of these words are directly chargeable to the artificial increase of our vocabulary by that school of 'embellishers' who flourished in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Perhaps the common man is not to be blamed for avoiding the use of a vocabulary which has never really been his, and for utilizing in the expression of certain ideas his own familiar stock of words. It is, in other words, a movement from the ground up, and as such deserves the same consideration that the student of literature gives to the popular ballad or the folk-tale.

2. Moreover it is a process which is essentially Teutonic. While the English have borrowed extensively from Latin, Greek, Scandinavian, indeed, from many tongues of earth, there was a time when the expression of new ideas was made possible by the new combination of speech-materials already on hand. Before we borrowed *disciple* our English ancestors said *leorningcniht*, and instead of *evangelist* they said *godspellere*, for *simple*, *unfold*, for *arrogance*, *oferhygd*, etc. Indeed this Teutonic tendency to recombine, for the expression of new ideas, material already in stock is still seen very generally in the German language. For our *impression* the German says *eindruck*, for *expression*, *ausdruck*, for *pronoun*, *fürwort*, for *invisible*, *unsichtbar*, etc. In many cases the man who uses the English verb-adverb combination is, as we have already seen, merely expressing in native terms what the Latin derivative originally expressed. *Break up* reproduces quite literally *bryttan*; *catch on* translates *comprehend*; *call off* renders *revocare*; *give off*, *emit*, etc. It is not surprising that an English speaker should have a feeling for a combina-

tion of familiar and native words which he does not have for loan-words.

3. But if the use of the verb-adverb combination gives to the uneducated speaker familiar material for the expression of his ideas, it at the same time relieves him of the necessity of memorizing many verbs of more highly specialized meaning. By combining *set* with several well-known particles he can eliminate *separate* 'set off,' *embellish* 'set off,' *explode* 'set off,' *assign* 'set off,' *display* 'set off,' *erect* 'set up,' *exalt* 'set up,' *advance* 'set out,' or by using *take* with the same group of particles he can avoid the use of *resemble* 'take after,' *humble* 'take down,' *deceive* 'take in,' *compromise* 'take in,' *remove* 'take off,' *receive* 'take up,' *hasten* 'take off,' *consume* 'take up,' *capture* 'take in,' *consider* 'take up,' *revoke* 'take up,' etc. While not all combinations will effect as great a saving as these two verbs make possible, still the number of highly specialized verbs which, because of the increasing use of the combination, repose unused in the growing volumes of Webster's dictionaries is very great. And when one considers that the latest edition of Webster boasts of some 400,000 words, any tendency toward the lightening of this burden might almost seem worthy of encouragement.

4. There is, moreover, another aspect to the combining process which appeals to many people. Not a few of these combinations are figurative and stand out in the speech of the common man with a richness and picturesqueness which the more literal loan-word, or even the simple native verb, lacks. The following examples show this very clearly:

catch on.....comprehend	*hold down*...retain possession of
bolster up....support	*pan out*.....result, succeed
chip in.....contribute	*pull out*.....depart
cut out.....eliminate	*sail in*.....begin, interfere
fed up.....satiated	*turn down*...reject
hang round.frequent	*wind up*.....conclude

And even tho the phrase may not be figurative, it is often more expressive than the simple loan-word. *Blow out,* for instance, tells the average person more of the method employed than does *extinguish.* So, also, *blow up* and *inflate, crumble up* and *disintegrate, eat up* and *consume, patch up* and *repair, plunk down* and *pay* (money), *raise up* and *resurrect, stretch out* and *extend,* present the same contrast as regards expressiveness and forcefulness. It is this phase of the matter, doubtless, which appeals most strongly to those who advocate increased usage of this style of vocabulary. The verb-adverb combination is not merely comprehensible to the most illiterate speaker of English, it not only appeals to him as something native and natural and personally belonging to him, but it possesses for all who hear it a certain amount of warmth and color and

force which the colder, more impersonal, more highly specialized, simple verb lacks.

5. And again, for the student of the history of the English language, there lies a strong argument for the use of these combinations in the fact that the tendency is closely akin to another process which has been changing the entire character of the English language during the past thousand years. Just as syntactical combinations have been gradually substituted for inflectional forms—prepositional phrases for genitives and datives, periphrastic verbs for subjunctive forms, phrasal comparison for inflectional, etc.—so a syntactical combination is now showing a tendency to supplant the simple verb of more highly specialized meaning. I take it that the process of eliminating emphasis on inflectional form and of substituting syntactical usage is a protest against an earlier trend toward the development of too elaborate, too fixed a system of inflection. We have largely thrown overboard a system which depends for an understanding of the meaning upon the inflectional forms of the individual words and we have developed instead a speech in which the clearness of thought-expression depends largely upon the connecting words, the position in the sentence, the inflection of the voice, and the context in general. And now we are protesting against the burden of an artificial vocabulary, a 'high-brow,' imported vocabulary, and in using the verb-adverb combination we are depending for the meaning upon the relation of the words combined, the order of the words, the sentence stress, and the context in general. *Offset* and *set off* assume different meanings because of the position of the particle *off; cool off* and *cool down,* as we have already seen, differ in the value of the combining particles, while the meaning of *blow up* can only be determined from the context.

Are we to believe that the next century or two will witness a great unburdening of the English vocabulary just as the past few centuries have simplified the inflectional system? Is this growing use of combination one of those great natural movements in language which will ultimately accomplish this lightening of the burden? The history of the development, and the strength of it in modern colloquial usage, render it entirely impossible to brush aside the matter as current slang and colloquialisms.

On the other hand one hesitates to encourage too freely the use of many of these combinations because of the responsibility of the trained and far-sighted student of English for the maintenance of certain standards in usage.

Verbs, like other parts of speech, tend to wear down and lose their linguistic individuality if used in too many ways. The auxiliaries *may, can, ought, shall,* etc., are good examples of this weakening of the

notional value of a verb. *Can* no longer means 'know,' *ought* is seldom associated with 'own' or 'owe.' In its manifold combinations and uses *get* may mean almost anything which the context may suggest, action, state or being. Likewise *come* tends to lose its action, its implication of motion, and become a mere weakling dependent upon the semasiological support of its context.

Of course much of this weakening is due to over-emphasis resulting from the continued figurative use of the combination, and, in that respect, the verb-adverb combination is no more liable to weakening from this cause than are adjectives or nouns. And yet the increasing variety of connotations is bound to blur and tone down the verb-personality.

7. Then again, owing to the multiplication of meanings, the possibility of confusion or of misunderstanding is greatly increased. A verb-combination that is capable of fifteen different uses or phases of meaning has become more or less a 'Jack of all trades,' and its capacity for good work on a given job is open to suspicion. Even though it is not likely that one would be long in doubt as to the meaning of *blow up* 'to inflate,' 'to explode,' 'to scold,' 'to praise extravagantly,' *lay for,* as applied to a hen or an enemy, *lay out* 'to plan' or 'to overcome,' *put off* 'to delay' or 'to explode,' *set out* 'to expose' or 'to attempt,' *take up* 'to raise' or 'to start hurriedly along,' yet it is not conducive to linguistic thrift but rather to a certain amount of verbosity, if the phrase is not self-explanatory. If one *holds up* a person he may be doing him a favor or a great wrong; if two actors *make up* they may resume a former friendship or merely their places on the stage; if an object is *all stuck up* it may be inclined to adhere or, in the language of O. Henry, it may have been treated much worse;[11] a man who *strikes out* may prove a menace to those around him or his departure may bring peace. When a man says "pull up" does he mean 'stop' or 'pull ahead'? Is the *running down* of a friend a physical or a moral tragedy, or merely the successful finding of him? When a housewife *does up* a dress, does she wash and iron it or does she wrap it up to send it to the laundry? *Get up* may have one of two meanings, according as the horse is being driven or lying contentedly in the barn. Even the newspaper humorist, as I have already noted,[12] is coming to depend more and more upon these combinations for his raw material.

8. Even tho the possibility of confusion or misunderstanding can be largely obviated by emphasis on attendant circumstances of speech, still there is the danger of lessening the capacity for precision in the expression of ideas if the more highly specialized verbs give way to commonplace combinations. The various implications of a highly figurative

[11] "We *stuck* that train *up* in broad daylight." *Sixes and Sevens,* 56.

[12] See page 18.

combination such as *cough up* 'to pay' complicate the expression of the idea. For there is present the suggestion of forced payment, of paying that which one has swallowed dishonestly, of paying when the act is an unpleasant one, etc. So the combinations *deal out* 'to distribute,' *fall thru* 'to fail,' *fed up* 'satiated,' *hang round* 'to frequent,' *plunk down* 'to pay,' *swear off* 'to renounce,' all add a certain amount of color to the idea which tends to retard the expression of the simple thought. And so it would seem that an effort for mere efficiency and simplicity in the expression of the idea would favor the retention of the simpler verbs such as *pay, distribute, fail, satiated, frequent, renounce,* rather than the more picturesque, 'hail-fellow-well-met' combination.

9. One cannot but suspect, after all, that much of the usage which I have attempted to analyze and explain is a result of linguistic laziness. Admitting that English speakers like that which is not artificial in the language but native and natural, and that they have a liking for the picturesque and colorful in preference to the coldly unsympathetic word of highly specialized meaning, still there remains the very obvious fact that the great majority do not like to go to the trouble of acquiring the words of nicer distinction. Getting along with that which one happens to find most convenient, whether it be in dress, in work, or in speech, is apt to be productive of slovenliness, of inefficiency, of ineffectiveness. It is easier to use *lay* with nine different combining particles to produce forty different phases of meaning than it is to have ready for instant use forty different words or phrases such as *save, cease work, plan, formulate, surpass, render helpless, stop, plow for the last time,* etc.

It would be manifestly unfair, then, to insist that the development and increased use of the verb-adverb combination is entirely conducive to linguistic thrift on the one hand or to mere linguistic laziness or slovenliness on the other. In so far as the use of these combinations is an honest protest against a greatly over-burdened English dictionary, in so far as it represents a sort of 'back to the land' movement in language which aims to cultivate and utilize that which is familiar and common ground for high and low alike, it must win a certain measure of approval, for it shows a linguistic thrift which is entirely reliable and wholesome. But unfortunately it cannot be questioned that much of this usage is due to mere linguistic laziness.

The historian of the English language is likely to view this matter with greater equanimity, I fancy, than does the teacher of rhetoric and composition because the historian knows that the most wholesome movements in the growth of our language have usually come from the common people, who take the shortest and easiest paths in the expression of ideas. These short-cuts of one century become the beaten highways

of the next and no amount of scholarly insistence has ever successfully withstood their development.

However, while we may be philosophical about the trend of speech in this direction, at the same time no one who feels the responsibility of leadership in the use of the English language can refuse a careful consideration to this particular phase of modern usage. Just how far are those who pride themselves upon a careful and cultivated use of English justified in using and encouraging in others the use of these verb-adverb combinations? How far are we justified in going with the current of popular usage, and at what point should we stop?

There can be no question that many combinations such as *tie up, reach out, fill in,* express ideas which cannot be exactly reproduced by any other phrase of equal simplicity and directness. It is also evident that there is justification for the occasional use of a figurative combination when it expresses an idea more forcibly and more picturesquely than would the literal verb or phrase. To *drop in* on one's friends, to *snuff out* a life, to *bolster up* failing courage—these combinations make the synonymous verbs *call, end, uphold* seem rather colorless and tame. Moreover, as we have seen, the literal verb-adverb combination at times expresses the idea more vividly than can its simpler, less familiar, synonym. And yet, beyond all these, there lie a great number of colloquial or slang combinations which should not be encouraged, not merely because they are bizarre and render impossible that modest reticence which characterizes good breeding in speech as well as in dress, but largely because they distract from the simple expression of the unqualified idea or else because they are not as exact as is the verb of more highly specialized meaning.

Slovenly and ineffective thinking, of course, obviates very largely the possibility of exactness and clearness of diction, just as slovenly speech and general inexactness of expression indicate a lack of clear thinking. Consequently the great task of the teacher of rhetoric and composition is to show the student, not so much that his phrases are fantastic and slangy and in bad taste generally, but rather that his combination *hold up* may mean any one of several things and therefore is not explicit enough to be acceptable, and, moreover, that it mars the impersonal, colorless presentation of the idea *to rob* by suggesting the more picturesque circumstances and methods of a "hold up."

There is great need, it seems to me, of a word-book or thesaurus or dictionary of synonyms wherein one can find as the guide word the common, obvious, even colloquial or slang verb-adverb combination. How often one can recall *run down* but not *belittle* or *disparage.* And yet it is

only an occasional book that condescends to recognize in such a way the more questionable colloquial and slang expressions. There need be no fear, if slang and colloquial usage be properly labeled in such a book, that it would encourage slovenly usage. Rather it would make more clear to the earnest seeker the line between good and bad because the person who takes the trouble to look in such a book is seeking to better his diction. If he by means of such a book steps from the colloquial, familiar expression of his idea to a more exact, less familiar word, as I have illustrated it above, he is likely to be benefited greatly.

In conclusion I would suggest that those who are today pace-makers in the use of the English language should be sure in using the popular verb-adverb combinations that they are giving in each instance evidence of linguistic thrift by a deliberate fostering of that which is natural and forceful and simple, and not of a linguistic indolence such as unquestionably inspires many who cater to the tastes of the common man, just because it is the easy and popular way. Some of these combinations have become so firmly imbedded in the language by the mere accident of their having been used by some master of prose or song that it would be almost sacrilege to suggest the substitution of any simple verb. Who would think of changing, for example, the wording of Tennyson's little lyric in the *Princess:*

As thro' the land at eve we went
  And pluck'd the ripen'd ears,
We *fell out,* my wife and I,
  O we *fell out* I know not why,
And kiss'd again with tears.
  And blessings on the *falling out*
That all the more endears,
  When we *fall out* with those we love,
And kiss again with tears!

No doubt others will, as the years go by, be similarly perpetuated, even some, perhaps, which are now generally regarded as slang. And yet the fact remains that popular usage has in the past been responsible for the loss of words and phrases which would be highly desirable today, and cannot be trusted always to do what is best for the language. And so the verb-adverb combination should be accepted in so far as it can become a useful part of the English vocabulary, but it should not be permitted to crowd out any verb which cannot well be spared.

APPENDIX I. NOUNS MADE FROM VERB-ADVERB COMBINATIONS

With the strong tendency on the part of speakers of English today to utilize the simple verb as a noun (e. g. *bid* 'invitation,' *invite* 'invitation,' *go* 'success') it is not surprising that many verb-adverb combinations should be substantivized. Perhaps the newest creations or adaptations in present-day English may be said to consist largely of these combination-nouns. And just as certain differences in accent, form, meaning, etc., developed in the compound verbs and their corresponding nouns in earlier English,[18] so likewise these newer combination-nouns are showing certain marked divergences from the verbs originating them.

The accent is always placed more strongly upon the first part of the combination-noun, whereas in the corresponding verb it is either quite strongly laid upon the particle or else is divided equally between verb and particle. So it is customary to accent differently such combinations as *clean up, do up, hold up, look out, turn out,* etc., according as they are verbal or substantive.

Naturally the gerund of the verb is used commonly to name an action. Examples are a *beating-up* 'a severe beating,' *bringing-up* 'rearing or training,' a *dressing-down* 'discipline,' a *falling-off* 'diminution,' a *falling-out* 'a quarrel,' *slowing-up,* a *stirring-up,* a *thinning-out,* a *toning-down,* etc. Even as early as the fifteenth century *Paston Letters* I find "attende to the *making up* of the seide evidencez" (p. 56).

But it is not felt to be necessary to change in any way the form of the verb-adverb combination in many cases. It is merely taken over and used as a noun. So one speaks of a *call-down* 'a reprimand,' of giving someone the *go-by* 'to pass without notice; to cut,' a *hold-up* 'a robbery,' a *let-up* 'a cessation,' a *mix-up* 'a muddle; a quarrel,' *put-in* 'interference,' a *send-off* 'a farewell gathering,' a *shake-up,* of being on the *watch-out,* of the *wind-up,* etc.

Occasionally the verb of the combination assumes a derivative suffix when a noun is formed as, for example, in the case of *hanger-on* or *looker-on.* It it is not unlikely that the latter word has been influenced by *onlooker.*

In *dugout, left-over* and *sawed-off* 'a short person,' the participial form of the verb appears.

It is interesting to note at the present time the development of special vocabularies which abound in these combination-nouns. Among

[18] See page 14 ff.

the students at Stanford the nouns *bawl-out* 'the term directory,' *hold-over* 'a student whose year does not end at Commencement time,' *jolly-up* 'a social gathering,' and *smoke-up* 'a mid-term warning,' are especially favored. Business men are apt to use such combination-nouns as *clean-up* 'a profitable transaction,' *come-back* 'recourse, retaliation,' *lay-off* 'temporary dismissal of workmen,' *lockout, rake-off, stand-in, walk-out,* etc. In the realm of sport one frequently meets with such terms as *frame-up* 'conspiracy,' *show-down* (a card term), *kick-off, line-up, touch-down* (foot-ball terms), *rub-down, set-to, take-off,* etc. Even the automobile vocabulary contains a few combination-nouns such as *blow-out, break-down, cut-out, smash-up,* also *raceabout, runabout, tourabout,* altho, of course, some of these are not confined exclusively to automobile usage.

For reasons not always easy to explain some of these nouns have come to be applied to persons, some are impersonal concrete nouns, while a few may be either concrete or abstract, tho, as has been shown above, the majority are still either pure gerunds or infinitive forms used to express or name actions or states. Examples of personal nouns are *cut-up* 'one who plays pranks,' *gadabout, roustabout, stand-by.* Of impersonal concrete nouns of this sort good examples are *cut-out* 'an automobile attachment,' *get-up* 'dress, array,' *hand-out* 'food or clothing given to a beggar,' *knockabout* (cf. runabout, etc., above), *lean-to, lockup* 'a jail,' *passover, pop-over, shakedown* 'an improvised bed,' *slip-over* 'a sleeveless sweater popularized by the recent work of the Red Cross,' *turnabout* 'a merry-go-round,' *turnover, write-up,* etc. Some few of these nouns have both concrete and abstract significations as in the case of *lookout,* which may signify either 'a person engaged in watching, a place from which to watch, or, the act of watching,' or *take-off* 'the place from which a jumper leaps, or, a burlesque,' or *turnout* 'equipage, or, act of gathering (as applied to persons).'

A few combination-nouns, while essentially verbal nouns, are rarely if ever used as verbs. Such are *hoedown* and *breakdown* meaning 'a noisy, rapid, shuffling dance,' *rake-off, roustabout,* and *show-down.*

A few of these nouns have even developed so far as to be susceptible of plural inflection. "We've heard considerable about these *goings-on* down in Hookerville," says one of the characters in *H. Finn* (78). *Hangers-on* and *lookers-on* may have been influenced by the earlier *onlookers,* while it is almost imperative that one should be able to pluralize such concrete nouns as *dugout, hand-out, leftover, runabout, slip-over,* etc.

One interesting modern development, *hand-me-down* 'a ready-made garment,' should be regarded rather as the substantivation of a phrase than the mere adaptation of a verb-adverb combination.

It is difficult to decide in certain instances whether one of these com-

bination-nouns should be written with a hyphen or as one word. In numerous examples above I have followed Webster in printing a hyphen when in current newspaper usage the hyphen is seldom used. Where a noun is unquestionably concrete the hyphen is quite generally omitted.

Because the use of a form as a noun is generally more recent than as a verb, as regards modern English, these combination-nouns are likely to be regarded as more surely colloquial or slangy than the corresponding verbs. It is slightly amusing to find that, as in the case of the verb, the editors of Webster's *Dictionary* occasionally refuse official recognition to a combination-noun but let it slip in as part of a definition. Which goes to show that the student of current tendencies is likely to be confronted not infrequently with the problem of classifying and defining a phrase which is rendering a definite service in language and yet has received no official recognition.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Occasionally the simpler infinitive form of the verb is employed with the particle as a combination adjective. Webster's *Dictionary* defines *bang-up* as 'first-rate; fine,' it is not unusual in the world of advertising to send out *follow-up* letters, to the police may come a *hurry-up* call, a prize-fighter receives a *knock-down* blow, a housewife prepares a *pick-up* lunch, a *put-up* job defeats a man in politics, one wears a *turn-down* collar, etc.

And, finally, it is even possible to illustrate a slight tendency to add a derivative suffix in the phrase *come-at-able* or *get-at-able,* the very awkward makeshift of the man who cannot recall the less familiar *attainable.*

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 018 794 854

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD AUXILIARY LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(650) 723-9201
salcirc@sulmail.stanford.edu
All books are subject to recall.
DATE DUE

APR 21 2001
JUN 27 2001
DEC 05 2001
DEC 01 2002